



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/396,428	09/15/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	SEDN/5915	7433

56015 7590 07/03/2006

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/  
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC  
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE  
SUITE 100  
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/396,428	HENDRICKS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hunter B. Lonsberry	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that the Florin and Granger references are not prior art for claim 1 (Amendment page 13-14).

Regarding applicant's argument, as discussed below, applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to support the priority claims to the 07/991,074. In particular, where teachings of an interface to the set top terminal for communicating video signals between the set top terminal and the hard ware upgrade. While there is evidence for video input and output via port 622, there is no disclosure of a disc storage device, which provides video signals.

Applicant's newly amended limitations with regards to an interface to the set top terminal for communicating data and video signals is taught by Florin at column 10, lines 7-19).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2623

2. Claims 1, 11, 23, 31, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the specification does not disclose a hardware upgrade which comprises an interface to the set top terminal for receiving and processing subscriber input. Applicant points to the interface being described on the first paragraph of page 54, of the parent application "07/991,074". The examiner has reviewed the portions pointed out by the applicant as well as pages 54-59 of the specification, and finds support for an interface, which passes data, but lacks support for communicating video signals.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6-13, 16-36, 38-44, and 47-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,583,560 to Florin in view of U.S. Patent 5,483,277 to Granger and U.S. Patent 5,192,999 to Graczyk.

Regarding claim 1, Florin discloses in figures 1 and 2 a transceiver 54 for use with a television program delivery system with menu selection of programs (figure 12), the set top terminal having a microprocessor 63 and microprocessor instructions for prompting generation of menus (column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6), comprising:

An interface 82 to the STB for communicating data and video signals between the STB and a disc storage device (column 10, lines 7-19, a CD ROM module may playback multimedia CD ROM titles, photo CDs and motion picture CDs), A disc storage device 70 (or optional hard drive, column 10, lines 7-26) connected to the interface providing local storage capacity,

And a microprocessor 63 connected between the interface and the disc storage device (figure 2).

Florin discloses the use of a number of plug in devices such as hard discs, modems, and CD-ROMs (column 10, lines 7-26), but is silent regarding the use of a hardware upgrade and the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Granger discloses in figure 6, an upgrade module 300 for a set top box 302 which enables a user to operate more than two channels simultaneously (column 7, lines 11-41) thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Florin to utilize a hardware upgrade as taught by Granger thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

The combination of Florin and Granger is silent regarding the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Graczyk discloses in figures 44-49, the use of a number of upgrade cards, including an audio upgrade card 510, which utilizes a microprocessor 33 (figure 28), which communicates with the CPU of the personal computer via interface 300, and includes an upgrade of an external CDROM, the personal computer includes STB functionality via the use of an onboard TV tuner (column 21, lines 19-59, column 22, lines 7-51, column 32, line 67-column 33, line 20, , lines 31-52, column 34, lines 3-6, 50-56), thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin and Granger to use a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface as taught by Graczyk, thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Regarding claim 2, Florin discloses that CDROM module 70 may play back an reference such as multimedia CD ROM titles (column 10, lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 4, Florin discloses that CDROM 70 is coupled to CPU 63, applications on CDROM 70 may be accessed by transceiver 54 (column 10, lines 7-19).

Regarding claims 6-8, Florin discloses that transceiver 54 may connect to external devices through a serial port or SCSI interface (column 10, lines 21-26).

Regarding claims 9-10, Florin discloses that the disc storage device may be a CD-ROM device (column 10, lines 7-19).

Regarding claim 11, Florin discloses in figures 1 and 2 a transceiver 54 for use with a television program delivery system with menu selection of programs (figure 12), the set top terminal having a microprocessor 63 and microprocessor instructions for prompting generation of menus (column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6), comprising:

A receiver 54 adapted to receive programs

An interface 64 to the STB for communicating data and video signals between the STB and a disc storage device (column 10, lines 7-19, a CD ROM module may playback multimedia CD ROM titles, photo CDs and motion picture CDs), A disc storage device 70 (or optional hard drive, column 10, lines 7-26) connected to the interface providing local storage capacity,

And a microprocessor 63 connected between the interface and the disc storage device (figure 2).

Florin discloses the use of a number of plug in devices such as hard discs, modems, and CD-ROMs (column 10, lines 7-26), but is silent regarding the use of a hardware upgrade or the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface .

Granger discloses in figure 6, an upgrade module 300 for a set top box 302 which enables a user to operate more than two channels simultaneously (column 7, lines 11-41) thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Florin to utilize a hardware upgrade as taught by Granger thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

The combination of Florin and Granger is silent regarding the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Graczyk discloses in figures 44-49, the use of a number of upgrade cards, including an audio upgrade card 510, which utilizes a microprocessor 33 (figure 28), which communicates with the CPU of the personal computer via interface 300, and includes an upgrade of an external CDROM, the personal computer includes STB functionality via the use of an onboard TV tuner (column 21, lines 19-59, column 22, lines 7-51, column 32, line 67-column 33, line 20, , lines 31-52, column 34, lines 3-6, 50-56), thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin and Granger to use a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface as taught by Graczyk, thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Regarding claim 12, Florin discloses in Figure 36, a menu function in which the currently viewed AV source icon is automatically highlighted (column 21, lines 41-67).

Regarding claim 13, Florin discloses that transceiver 54 may connect to external devices through a serial port or SCSI interface (column 10, lines 21-26).

Granger discloses that a plugin expansion device connects to a STB in figures 6-7 (column 7, lines 11-41).

The combination of Florin and Granger fails to disclose the use of an expansion card slot and expansion card connector.

Graczyk is relied upon to teach the use of an expansion card slot 540 with connectors (figure 45), an upgrade card 510 (figure 44) fits into expansion card slot 540 via a connector.

Regarding claim 16, Florin discloses that one or more additional devices may be connected to the terminal (column 10, lines 21-26, figure 36).

Regarding claim 19, Florin discloses that the A/V connect module 66 may output for display signals from multiple connected devices simultaneously (column 9, lines 3-9).

Regarding claim 20, Florin discloses the use of a modem (column 10, lines 21-25).

Regarding claims 21-22 see claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 23, Florin discloses in figures 1 and 2 a transceiver 54 for use with a television program delivery system with menu selection of programs (figure 12), the set top terminal having a microprocessor 63 and microprocessor instructions for prompting generation of menus (column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6), comprising:

An interface 82 to the STB for communicating data and video signals between the STB and a disc storage device (column 10, lines 7-19, a CD ROM module may playback multimedia CD ROM titles, photo CDs and motion picture CDs), A disc storage device 70 (or optional hard drive, column 10, lines 7-26) connected to the interface providing local storage capacity,

And a microprocessor 63 connected between the interface and the disc storage device (figure 2).

Florin discloses the use of a number of plug in devices such as hard discs, modems, and CD-ROMs (column 10, lines 7-26), but is silent regarding the use of a hardware upgrade and a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Granger discloses in figure 6, an upgrade module 300 for a set top box 302 which enables a user to operate more than two channels simultaneously (column 7, lines 11-41) thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Florin to utilize a hardware upgrade as taught by Granger thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

The combination of Florin and Granger is silent regarding the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Graczyk discloses in figures 44-49, the use of a number of upgrade cards, including an audio upgrade card 510, which utilizes a microprocessor 33 (figure 28), which communicates with the CPU of the personal computer via interface 300, and includes an upgrade of an external CDROM, the personal computer includes STB functionality via the use of an onboard TV tuner (column 21, lines 19-59, column 22, lines 7-51, column 32, line 67-column 33, line 20, , lines 31-52, column 34, lines 3-6, 50-56), thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade

Art Unit: 2623

processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin and Granger to use a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface as taught by Graczyk, thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Regarding claims 24 and 27, Florin discloses that the TV program delivery system may be satellite or cable (column 8, lines 3-17).

Regarding claims 25-26, Florin discloses in figure 1, a service provider 50, which delivers programming to a user device (column 8, lines 7-12).

Regarding claim 28, see claim 15.

Regarding claims 29-30, see claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 31, Florin discloses in figures 1 and 2 a transceiver 54 for use with a television program delivery system with menu selection of programs (figure 12),

Art Unit: 2623

the set top terminal having a microprocessor 63 and microprocessor instructions for prompting generation of menus (column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6), comprising:

An interface 82 to the STB for communicating data and video signals between the STB and a disc storage device (column 10, lines 7-19, a CD ROM module may playback multimedia CD ROM titles, photo CDs and motion picture CDs),

A disc storage device 70 (or optional hard drive, column 10, lines 7-26) connected to the interface providing local storage capacity,

a microprocessor 63 connected between the interface and the disc storage device (figure 2)

an output 69 connected to the receiver and the storage device wherein the output accepts TV program signals from the receiver and data signals from the storage device.

Florin discloses the use of a number of plug in devices such as hard discs, modems, and CD-ROMs (column 10, lines 7-26), but is silent regarding the use of a hardware upgrade and the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Granger discloses in figure 6, an upgrade module 300 for a set top box 302 which enables a user to operate more than two channels simultaneously (column 7, lines 11-41) thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Florin to utilize a hardware upgrade as taught by Granger thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

The combination of Florin and Granger is silent regarding the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Graczyk discloses in figures 44-49, the use of a number of upgrade cards, including an audio upgrade card 510, which utilizes a microprocessor 33 (figure 28), which communicates with the CPU of the personal computer via interface 300, and includes an upgrade of an external CDROM, the personal computer includes STB functionality via the use of an onboard TV tuner (column 21, lines 19-59, column 22, lines 7-51, column 32, line 67-column 33, line 20, , lines 31-52, column 34, lines 3-6, 50-56), thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin and Granger to use a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface as taught by Graczyk, thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Regarding claims 32-33, Florin discloses in figure 2, that output 69, may be coupled to a TV 58 out connect to an AV device 57 (column 9, lines 4-10).

Regarding claim 34, see claim 2.

Regarding claim 35, Florin discloses that CPU 63 is connected to CDROM 70 via system bus 64 in figure 2.

Regarding claim 36 see claim 4.

Regarding claim 38, see claim 15.

Regarding claims 39-40 see claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 41, Florin discloses a method for delivering TV programs through a TV program delivery system (figure 1) with menu selection of programs (figure 12, column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6) comprising:

Receiving a TV program from a headend 50 (column 8, lines 8-12),

Communicating data and video signals (column 10, lines 7-19, a CD ROM module may playback multimedia CD ROM titles, photo CDs and motion picture CDs), interface 82 within the STB (column 8, lines 40-44), the set top terminal having a microprocessor 63 and microprocessor instructions for prompting generation of menus (column 9, line 59-column 10, line 6)

Providing TV program signals to the STB based on the subscriber input (column 11, lines 36-59);

Accessing data via disc storage device 70 (or optional hard drive, column 10, lines 7-26) connected to the interface providing local storage capacity

Displaying the TV program or information based on the accessed data (column 9, lines 4-10).

Florin inherently includes a microprocessor coupled to the CDROM or hard disc as a microprocessor is required to interface and control the media.

Florin discloses the use of a number of plug in devices such as hard discs, modems, and CD-ROMs (column 10, lines 7-26), but is silent regarding the use of a hardware upgrade the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Granger discloses in figure 6, an upgrade module 300 for a set top box 302 which enables a user to operate more than two channels simultaneously (column 7, lines 11-41) thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Florin to utilize a hardware upgrade as taught by Granger thus enabling a user to expand the capabilities of a STB in the future.

The combination of Florin and Granger is silent regarding the use of a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface.

Graczyk discloses in figures 44-49, the use of a number of upgrade cards, including an audio upgrade card 510, which utilizes a microprocessor 33 (figure 28), which communicates with the CPU of the personal computer via interface 300, and



Art Unit: 2623

includes an upgrade of an external CDROM, the personal computer includes STB functionality via the use of an onboard TV tuner (column 21, lines 19-59, column 22, lines 7-51, column 32, line 67-column 33, line 20, , lines 31-52, column 34, lines 3-6, 50-56), thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin and Granger to use a microprocessor capable of communications with the microprocessor of the set top terminal through the upgrade interface as taught by Graczyk, thus reducing the CPU load of the primary processor by utilizing an upgrade processor to handle the sound generation and enable the connection of a wide variety of computer peripherals.

Regarding claim 42, see claim 9.

Regarding claim 43, see claim 4.

Regarding claim 44, see claim 2.

Regarding claims 47-48, Florin discloses that information concerning the programs is retrieved in the VBI (column 9, lines 13-16, figure 3b, column 10, lines 45-67, column 14, line 59-column 15, line 7).

Regarding claims 49-50, Florin discloses that a user input is received via a remote control 60 (column 8, lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 51, Florin discloses generating a menu on a television (figure 12) and receiving menu selections via subscriber input (column 15, lines 12-37).

Regarding claim 52, Florin discloses that once a user presses the select button 155 over a time slot the program is displayed (column 15, lines 34-36).

Regarding claims 53-54, see claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 55, see claim 13.

4. Claims 5, 37, 45, 46 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,583,560 to Florin in view of U.S. Patent 5,483,277 to Granger and U.S. Patent 5,192,999 to Graczyk in further view of U.S. Patent 5,638,426 to Lewis and U.S. Patent 5,247,575 to Sprague.

Regarding claims 5, 37, 45, 46 and 56-57, Florin discloses a receiver 54, which interfaces with a CDROM 70 and receives programming from a provider 50 (figures 1 and 2) and information via the VBI.

The combination of Florin, Granger and Graczyk fails to disclose receiving information concerning programs, monitoring the information and accessing information via a disc storage device in response to monitoring.

Lewis discloses a multimedia processing system in which a TV program is synchronized to supplemental data on a remote CD/I via a cable or broadcast feed, a user can then access the related information in more detail (column 15, lines 21-29, 43-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin, Granger and Graczyk to utilize the supplemental data as taught by Lewis, thus enabling a user to learn more about a subject in greater detail.

The combination of Florin, Granger, Graczyk and Lewis fails to disclose accessing a local disc device.

Sprague discloses a computing device with a local CDROM, a user may search keywords and upon receiving authorization information, the CDROM is accessed locally (column 16, lines 39-58, column 17, lines 10-22, column 19, lines 1-4, column 20, lines 5-29) thus providing faster access times.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin Granger, Graczyk and Lewis to utilize the local CDROM access of Sprague in order to provide faster access times to requested data.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,583,560 to Florin in view of U.S. Patent 5,483,277 to Granger and U.S. Patent 5,192,999 to Graczyk in further view of U.S. Patent 5,432,542 to Thilbadeau.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Florin, Granger, and Graczyk discloses a STB.

The combination of Florin, Granger, and Graczyk fails to disclose the use of an HDTV terminal.

Thilbadeau discloses the use of an HDTV terminal (column 5, lines 32-45) thus enabling a viewer to watch a program in more detail.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin, Granger and Graczyk to utilize an HDTV terminal, as taught by Thilbadeau in order to provide a higher quality picture thus enabling a viewer to watch a program in more detail.

6. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,583,560 to Florin in view of U.S. Patent 5,483,277 to Granger and U.S. Patent 5,192,999 to Graczyk in further view of U.S. Patent 4,920,339 to Friend.

Regarding claims 17-18, Florin discloses that a SCSI interface may be utilized for accessing digital storage devices such as hard disks (column 10, lines 21-23).

The combination of Florin, Granger, and Graczyk does not disclose if more than one hardware upgrade is connected together in a daisy chain arrangement.

Friend discloses the use of a SCSI daisy chain system in a personal computer which allows for connections between a number of hardware upgrades such as printers, disc drives, compact disk readers or other computers, and allows for each device to have an address and allows neighboring devices to find out the addresses of other

Art Unit: 2623

devices via an interrogation protocol (column 1, line 65-column 2, line 11, line 61-column 3, line 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Florin, Granger, and Graczyk to utilize a SCSI daisy chain as taught by Friend, thus allowing a number of computer upgrades to be connected to a computer via a single port, and allowing easy recognition of the addresses on other devices within the daisy chain via the use of an interrogation protocol.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 571-272-7298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HBL



JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600